

# Pupil premium strategy statement – President Kennedy School.

This statement details our school's use of pupil premium (and recovery premium) funding to help improve the attainment of our disadvantaged pupils.

It outlines our pupil premium strategy, how we intend to spend the funding in this academic year and the outcomes for disadvantaged pupils last academic year.

## School overview.

Detail	Data
Number of pupils in school	Yr 7-11 = 1550 (506) Yr 7-P16 = 1825 (548)
Proportion (%) of pupil premium eligible pupils	Yr 7-11 = 32.6% Yr7-P16 = 30%
Academic year/years that our current pupil premium strategy plan covers ( <b>3-year plans are recommended – you must still publish an updated statement each academic year</b> )	2021-2024
Date this statement was published	December 2023
Date on which it will be reviewed	July 2024
Statement authorised by	Samantha Rooke Headteacher
Pupil premium lead	Tyson Lane Deputy Headteacher
Governor / Trustee lead	Mike Moseley Chair of Governors

## Funding overview.

Detail	Amount
Pupil premium funding allocation this academic year	£505,080
Recovery premium funding allocation this academic year <i>Recovery premium received in academic year 2023/24 cannot be carried forward beyond August 31, 2024.</i>	£134,688
Pupil premium funding carried forward from previous years ( <i>enter £0 if not applicable</i> )	£0
<b>Total budget for this academic year</b>	<b>£639,768</b>

<i>If your school is an academy in a trust that pools this funding, state the amount available to your school this academic year</i>	
--	--

## Part A: Pupil premium strategy plan.

### Statement of intent.

The Pupil Premium is allocated to schools based upon the number of low-income families who are currently known to be eligible for FSM as well as students who have been looked after continuously for more than six months. The pupil premium is calculated on the number of students who have been eligible for free school meals (FSM) at any point in the last 6 years.

Pupil Premium is directly overseen by the Headteacher and reported to the Governing Body every term. The Deputy Headteacher has the responsibility of reporting every term the impact of pupil premium spending on student progress. However, the progress and wellbeing of all disadvantaged students is the responsibility of all leaders in the school through ensuring exceptional first wave teaching and wrap around care, support, and guidance. There is a robust and overt focus in every school system and a clear process of accountability through Performance Management for all teachers. The school's college system liaises closely with the DSL, SENCo, and external partners including Coventry Virtual School to support our most vulnerable including LAC and students with social workers. The school has been and continues to be involved in extensive Trauma Informed and Attachment training for all staff.

Our strategic approach to the use of additional funding at President Kennedy School and targeting of Pupil Premium spend has been devised through a tiered approach based on the Education Endowment Foundation (EEF) toolkit and evidenced based best practice and aims to address the barriers some students may face:

#### **Tiered Approach:**

1. **Teaching & Staffing Support:** High-quality first wave teaching is at the heart of our approach and the recruitment and retention of high-quality teaching staff is proven to have the greatest impact on closing the disadvantage attainment gap and one which will be crucial to all learners at President Kennedy School. Our values are to remove barriers to learning and this is supported by high quality pastoral and college staff.
2. **Targeted Academic Intervention:** integral to our approach is our cohesive intervention programmes for all students, notably our most disadvantaged. Many of these programmes are delivered by our own staff and more recently has been supported by the National Tutoring Programme for pupils whose education has been worst affected.
3. **Involvement in enrichment activities:** providing social capital and building confidence in our learners is a crucial part of our enrichment programme for all year groups and complements the high-quality teaching and intervention approach.

Our intention is that all pupils, irrespective of their background or the challenges they face, make outstanding progress, and achieve high attainment across the curriculum. For the forthcoming academic year (2023-24) the Local Governing Body of the school has allocated almost 90% of the budget to focus upon high quality learning in English and Maths at Key Stage 4 as well as in improving the basic literacy and numeracy of the students in The Bridge (Year 7) and The Gateway (Year 8). The governors believe that providing additional resources to improve the development of these basic skills will

improve the life chances of President Kennedy School students and ensure their success at each stage of their education.

## Challenges.

This details the key challenges to achievement that we have identified among our disadvantaged pupils.

Challenge number	Detail of challenge
1	<p><b>Literacy:</b> CATs Testing, on entry teacher assessments and KS2 data indicate that disadvantaged pupils generally have lower levels of reading comprehension than peers. This impacts their progress in all subjects.</p> <p><b>Cohort</b></p> <p>2020 – 2021: 75/329 under expected reading = 23% 24/329 under expected reading PP = 7% 32% of all not achieving in reading are PP</p> <p>2021 – 2022: 94/304 under expected reading = 31% 37/304 under expected reading PP = 12% 39% of all not achieving in reading are PP</p> <p>2022-2023: 62/300 under expected reading = 20.7% 29/98 under expected reading PP = 29.6% 46.8% of all not achieving in reading are PP (PP = 32.7% of the cohort)</p> <p>2023-2024 97/311 under expected reading = 30.1% 32/91 under expected reading PP = 35.1% 33.0% of all not achieving in reading are PP. (PP = 29.3% of the cohort)</p>
2	<p><b>Maths:</b> CATs Testing, on entry teacher assessments and KS2 data indicates that disadvantaged pupils generally have lower levels of problem solving than their peers. Maths attainment of disadvantaged pupils is generally lower than that of their peers.</p> <p>2020 – 2021: 73/329 under expected maths = 22% 25/329 under expected maths PP = 8% 34% of all not achieving in maths are PP</p> <p>2021 – 2022:</p>

	<p>94/304 under expected maths = 31%  34/329 under expected maths PP = 10%  36% of all not achieving in maths are PP</p> <p>2022-2023:  68/300 under expected maths = 22.7%  35/98 under expected maths PP = 35.7%  51.5% of all not achieving in maths are PP</p> <p>2023-2024:  63/311 under expected in maths = 20%  24/91 under expected in maths PP = 26.4%  38.1% of all not achieving in maths are PP</p>
3	<p><b>Intake &amp; KS4 Progress:</b></p> <p>For our 2023 Cohort, our PP intake has an average KS2 Scaled Score of 102.8 compared to non-PP 105.0 (based on last actual KS2 data). Our 4-year Y11 rolling average shows that disadvantaged students achieve 0.3 grades more progress compared to disadvantaged students nationally but are on average progress 0.44 grades less than the whole cohort and nationally all non-disadvantaged students. Our disadvantaged students' attainment (irrespective of wider context and prior attainment) achieves on average 1.06 grades lower than non-disadvantaged students, based on Attainment 8 scores of 2023 cohort. This drops to 0.75 grades difference if we remove 9 PP students with attendance below 50%.</p>
4	<p><b>Attendance &amp; Wellbeing:</b></p> <p>Student and parent voice, including our well-being surveys during lockdown and beyond have identified increased anxiety, demotivation and low confidence levels which has impacted on attendance to online learning and attendance since returning to school. Anxiety about lost learning, exams and social isolation challenges particularly affect disadvantaged pupil. Our attendance data over the last 3 years indicates that attendance among disadvantaged pupils has been between 3-5% lower than for non-disadvantaged pupils.</p> <p>In the last 3 years teacher referrals for support increased significantly. Students (most of whom are disadvantaged) currently require additional support with social and emotional needs. All students are currently receiving small group or 1-1 interventions with either SENCo, College Learning Mentor or Deputy DSL and Attendance and Inclusion Team. The counselling caseloads spread between our own and external counsellor and the school nursing service have also increased. We have therefore used money to provide both this external and internal counselling service as well as to employ Learning mentors for each year group.</p>
5	<p><b>Access to wider enrichment activities:</b></p> <p>Surveys and in school tracking systems highlight that disadvantaged students are less likely to access the range of enrichment opportunities</p>

	available to all students. Data highlights that non-disadvantaged students are 10-20% more likely to access enrichment activities without targeted support. However, this is something College Teams and LG are very much aware of.
6	<b>Access to consistent healthy diet and lifestyle:</b> Our extended tutor curriculum and student voice within these programmes suggest that the education, emotional and social wellbeing of many of our disadvantaged pupils have been impacted by partial school closures to a greater extent than for other pupils. This has also impacted their return to school following school closure (linked to the Covid-19 pandemic). These findings are backed up by several national studies. Student voice and parent voice also suggest a lack of positive routines, including sleep, exercise, and healthy eating.
7	<b>Limited access to digital &amp; educational resources:</b> Surveys conducted during the pandemic highlighted that our disadvantaged students had less access to a range of digital resources at home, or shared devices and/or used devices that limited access to learning opportunities. Digital surveys demonstrated that 154 disadvantaged students (108 PP+46 SEND, of which 34 were PP+SEND) did not have digital devices and/or access to an appropriate internet connection. This is frequently being reviewed to ensure we do all we can, as a school, to support learning.

## Intended outcomes.

This explains the outcomes we are aiming for **by the end of our current strategy plan**, and how we will measure whether they have been achieved.

Intended outcome	Success criteria
1. Reduce the gap between chronological reading age and actual reading age in Key Stage 3	The number of students at chronological reading age is as close to the cohort figure as possible. The size of gap between chronological age and reading age is smaller than what it was when students first started President Kennedy School.
2. Targeted reading strategies in first wave teaching in Key Stage 4 to ensure older students can access the curriculum	President Kennedy School continues to perform higher than national average in the reading section of the GCSE English Language exam.
3. Increase participation in enrichment activities across each Key Stage.	Whole School Passport Tracker shows that disadvantaged students are in line with rest of cohort.
4. Increase the mathematical fluency in all Key Stage 3 students in the 4 key operations	Students in line with their target grade by end of year 9.
5. Targeted small group mathematical intervention at Key Stage 4 focused	Students that are part of the targeted intervention achieve their target grade.

upon improving the application of mathematical skills	
6. Targeted small group English intervention at Key Stage 4 focused upon improving reading, writing and vocabulary.	Students that are part of the targeted intervention achieve their target grade.
7. To improved health & wellbeing for all pupils, including those who are disadvantaged.	Sustained high levels of wellbeing from across 3-year plan demonstrated by: qualitative and quantitative data from student voice, student and parent surveys and reduction in referrals.
8. Increase attendance of DA and reduce the gap	DA = 95%
9. Reduce persistent absence	50% reduction in number of DA students with Persistent Absences
10. Reduce repeat exclusions	50% Reduction of repeat exclusions for disadvantaged students.
11. Ensure first choice positive destinations for year 11 and Post 16 students	100% of disadvantaged students have first choice positive destinations including at P18 to university, apprenticeship, or employment of choice
12. Culture and increase the sense of inclusive belonging across the school	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5:1 rewards points on half termly basis for all DA students</li> </ul> All DA students equipped with PK '5' and uniform.

## Activity in this academic year

This details how we intend to spend our pupil premium (and recovery premium) funding **this academic year** to address the challenges listed above.

## Teaching (for example, CPD, recruitment and retention)

Budgeted cost: £ 450,000

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
	Improving literacy in all subject areas in line with recommendations in the EEF will help support attainment across the curriculum for disadvantaged students. Recruiting expert staff will also support the CPDL of non-English teachers in delivering effective literacy strategies in first wave teaching.	1 & 2

Full Time Literacy Leader in the Bridge (primary Teacher)	Evidence of impact of Bridge interventions on student progress in KS3 and KS4 outcomes. <a href="#">Standardised tests   Assessing and Monitoring Pupil Progress   Education Endowment Foundation   EEF Improving Literacy in Secondary Schools</a>	
Full Time Literacy Leader in the Gateway (primary Teacher)	Evidence of impact of Gateway interventions on student progress in KS3 and KS4 outcomes. <a href="#">Standardised tests   Assessing and Monitoring Pupil Progress   Education Endowment Foundation   EEF Improving Literacy in Secondary Schools</a>	1 & 2
1X English Teacher (overstaffing)	Evidence of impact of targeted English interventions on student progress in KS4 outcomes. <a href="#">Improving Literacy in Secondary Schools</a>	1,2, 3 & 4
1X Maths Teacher (overstaffing)	Evidence of impact of targeted Maths interventions on student progress in KS4 outcomes <a href="#">Teaching mathematics at key stage 3 - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)</a>	2,3,4
1X day of trust KS2/3 Maths Lead to improve curriculum sequencing and maths CPDL on effective maths strategies on first wave teaching.	Evidence of impact of differentiated approaches, CPDL and year 7 & 8 curriculum provision on student progress in Year 7 and Year 8 Maths. <a href="#">Teaching mathematics at key stage 3 - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)</a>	2, 3, 4
Full Time HLTA in Bridge (leader of Interventions)	Evidence of impact of targeted interventions on student progress in Year 7. <a href="#">Improving Literacy in Secondary Schools</a>	1, 2 & 4
Lexonic Training x 3 members of staff	Evidence of impact of targeted Lexonic interventions on student progress in Year 7 & 8. <a href="#">Improving Literacy in Secondary Schools</a>	1, 2
Fresh Start Training x 3 members of staff	Evidence of impact of targeted Fresh Start interventions on student progress in Year 7 & 8 and KS4 outcomes. <a href="#">Improving Literacy in Secondary Schools</a>	1, 2

### Targeted academic support (for example, tutoring, one-to-one support, structured interventions)

Budgeted cost: £ 129,000



Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Digital Resources	Increased access to Teams and internet to support home learning and research.	4, 7
Fresh Start	Evidence of impact of targeted interventions on student progress in Year 7 & 8. <a href="#">Small group tuition   Toolkit Strand   Education Endowment Foundation   EEF</a>	1,2,3,4
Read Eggspress	Evidence of impact of targeted interventions on student progress in Year 7.	1,2,3,4
Accelerated Reader	Evidence of impact of targeted interventions on student progress in Year 7 & 8.	1,2,3,4
Lexonik	Evidence of impact of targeted interventions on student progress in Year 7.	1,2,3,4
Nessy	Evidence of impact of targeted interventions on student progress in Year 7.	2,3,
Time Table Rockstars	Evidence of impact of targeted interventions on student progress in Year 7.	2,3,
Power of 2	Evidence of impact of targeted interventions on student progress in Year 7.	2,3
Reading Inference	New approach but research highlights impact on improved reading for understanding.	1,2
Lexonik Leap	Evidence of impact of targeted interventions on student progress in Year 7.	1,2
Fresh Start Fast Track Tutoring	Evidence of impact of targeted interventions on student progress in Year 7. <a href="#">Small group tuition   Toolkit Strand   Education Endowment Foundation   EEF</a>	1,2
Fine Motor Skills	New approach but research highlights impact on improved and sustained handwriting	3
KS 4 Academic mentoring	Student Voice positive and KS 4 outcomes improved for targeted students. <a href="#">One to one tuition   EEF (educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk)</a>	3,4
KS4 Targeted Intervention Days eg HAPP	Student Voice positive and KS 4 outcomes improved for targeted students, in line with cohort. <a href="#">One to one tuition   EEF (educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk)</a> <a href="#">Small group tuition   Toolkit Strand   Education Endowment Foundation   EEF</a>	3,4

## Wider strategies (for example, related to attendance, behaviour, wellbeing)

Budgeted cost: £60,000

Activity	Evidence that supports this approach	Challenge number(s) addressed
Breakfast Club	Improved attendance and positive student voice on well-being survey. <b>DfE: Evaluation of Breakfast Clubs in Schools with High Levels of Deprivation 2017</b>	3,4,6
Trauma Informed Training Approach	Reduced exclusions and improved engagement for most vulnerable students with ACES. <b>(REES Centre Research)</b>	3,4,5,6
Subsidised Enrichment opportunities	Increased take up and access on trips and enrichment activities. PK own tracking system <b>EEF: Improving the teaching and learning of life skills and enrichment.</b>	4,5
Revision Guides and resources	Increased access to resources and improved KS4 outcomes.	3,7
Learning Mentor Case-load for attendance and well-being	Improved attendance for targeted case load. <a href="#">Improving School Attendance</a>	3,4,5
Access to trained in-school Careers Advisor for 1-1 careers Support and Guidance	Increased trend in first choice destinations and 0% NEETs. <b>Careers England Report</b> <b>DfE: Careers Guidance for Schools</b>	4,5
Access to trained in school counsellor	Improved attendance for targeted case load and engagement. Improved outcomes and positive destinations for case-loads. <a href="#">Adolescent mental health: A systematic review on the effectiveness of school-based interventions   Early Intervention Foundation (eif.org.uk)</a>	3,4,5,6
Learning Hub Targeted Intervention programmes	Reduced exclusions and improved attendance for targeted students. <b>Exclusion Review – Edward Timps</b>	3,4,5

**Total budgeted cost: £ 639,000**

## Part B: Review of the previous academic year

### Outcomes for disadvantaged pupils

In 2022-23 the school continued to provide a range of intervention and support strategies in order for our most disadvantaged students to benefit from the funding provided. These included several targeted literacy and numeracy strategies focused on developing literacy and numeracy skills as well as improving their holistic well-being, for students across Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 4.

The impact of these programmes have been monitored and evaluated over the last 10 years in the Bridge and over the last 3 years in the Gateway, since the appointment of primary teachers in the Bridge and Gateway. The aim of these interventions was to ensure that our most disadvantaged students could access their curriculum and remove a range of barriers to learning, which has been compounded by the pandemic and loss of face-to-face learning. Student progress was tracked using baseline teacher assessment and diagnostic assessments, including CATs testing. Whilst it's too early to judge the full impact of these programmes, initial analysis demonstrates that most students made positive progress over the course of the last 12 months in all intervention programmes, although the rate of progress during lockdown periods slowed in reading. The intervention programme continues to have a positive impact and showed the following for the 2022-23 academic year:

- For Nessy, 100 % of children had a positive rate of progress in spelling and reading, with an average number of words learned reading = 544 and the average number of words learned spelling = 368.
- In the Year 7 Lexonik Vocabulary programme students received Lexonik training (an hour a week for 6 weeks) On average, students reading ages increased by 43 months.
- Year 7 Times Tables Rockstars showed gains in speed of responses moving from initial speeds of around 14 seconds to 10 seconds.
- Year 7 have also taken part in the NGRT assessments which has shown some promising developments as the cohort had an average test age of 11 years and 7 months in September but came out with an average reading age of 11 years and 10 months. However, when assessed again in December the average test age was 11 years and 9 months compared to an average reading age of 12 years and 9 months (which demonstrated an average increase of around a year in the one term they have been at the school). Pupil premium data for the cohort was also positive going from a below chronological reading age of 11 years and 4 months in September to an above chronological reading age of 12 years and 5 months.
- In Year 8 Reading Eggspress the Class average Lexile growth +167. Whilst the reading inference programme saw an average increase in reading ages between 15-19 months.
- In Year 8 the Lexonik programme saw reading ages improve on average 53 months.

Analysis of GCSE results for last academic year indicate a Progress 8 score of -0.22 for pupil premium students (an increase from last year's figure of -0.29) which is much better than the Coventry and National figure (around -0.5). Suggesting our PP students make better progress than others in the City and Nationally compared to other schools. If we remove the 9 students who had below 50% attendance then the progress 8 figure goes up to +0.03 which is above the P8 national figure for the entire country.

## Externally provided programmes

Please include the names of any non-DfE programmes that you used your pupil premium (or recovery premium) to fund in the previous academic year.

Programme	Provider

## Service pupil premium funding (optional)

<i>For schools that receive this funding, you may wish to provide the following information: <b>How our service pupil premium allocation was spent last academic year</b></i>
<b>The impact of that spending on service pupil premium eligible pupils</b>

## Further information (optional)

*Use this space to provide any further information about your pupil premium strategy. For example, about your strategy planning, implementation and evaluation, or other activity that you are delivering to support disadvantaged pupils, that is not dependent on pupil premium or recovery premium funding.*